

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending and rejected in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 3-8 and 15 are being amended. Claim 2 is being canceled. Claims 1 and 3-24 remain pending after this amendment. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 1 and 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC § 102(e) as unpatentable over Ogawa. Since claim 2 is being canceled, Applicant addresses this rejection with regard to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not prior art. Ogawa was filed on June 17, 2002. The present application was filed on December 21, 2001. Since the Ogawa reference was filed after the present application and is not based on an international application filed before the present application, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not 102(e) art and cannot be used as prior art against the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

In paragraphs 3-5, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 USC § 102(e) over Ogawa or alternatively under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Ogawa. For the same reasons as stated above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not prior art and requests that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

In paragraph 6-14 and 16 [sic], the Examiner rejected claims 4-8 and 15-17 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Ogawa in view of Subramanian. For the same reasons as stated above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not prior art and requests that the rejections of claims 4-8 and 15-17 be withdrawn.

In paragraph 15 [sic], the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Ogawa in view of Subramanian. For the same reasons as stated above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not prior art and requests that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

In paragraph 17-22, 25 and 26, the Examiner rejected claims 10-14, 23 and 24 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Ogawa in view of Subramanian. For the same reasons as stated above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not prior art and requests that the rejections of claims 10-14, 23 and 24 be withdrawn.

In paragraphs 23 and 24, the Examiner rejected claims 18-22 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Ogawa in view of Subramanian. For the same reasons as stated above with regard

to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ogawa is not prior art and requests that the rejections of claims 18-22 be withdrawn.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 650-856-6500.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823

Dated: January 14, 2005
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

Date: January 14, 2005 By: Eileen Janikowski
Eileen Janikowski